

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 11-14, 18, 22 and 23 are currently pending. As a final attempt to advance prosecution, the applicants have amended claim 1. Support for the limitation of claim 1 can be found throughout the specification, e.g., page 5, line 19, page 6, line 8 and page 6, line 11.

It is submitted that the claims, herewith and as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited in the Office Action, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

II. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-14, 18, and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,805,127 to Karasic ("Karasic") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,755,191 to Bertoch et al ("Bertoch").

The applicants believe that the amendment to claim 1 renders the rejection over the combination of Karasic and Bertoch to be moot as neither reference teaches or suggest the added element. The applicants also refer to their previous responses filed with the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review and response filed with the RCE on 21 January 2009.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and an early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited. Because Applicant maintains that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicant reserves the right to address such comments

Statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the Applicants' undersigned attorney and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the respective reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: /Howard C. Lee/
Ronald R. Santucci Howard C. Lee
Reg. No. 28,988 Reg. No. 48,104
P: (212) 588-0800
F: (212) 588-0500